DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 168 659 JC 790 244

AUTHOR Callas, Dennis
TITLE Campus Participation in the Development and Implementation of Faculty Selection Procedures.
PUB DATE 12 Mar 79
NOTE 54p.; Ed. D. Practicum, Nova University ; Parts of appendix may not reproduce clearly

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Community Colleges; Employment Interviews; *Faculty Recruitment; *Junior Colleges; *Personnel Policy; Student Attitudes; Student Participation; Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Participation; *Teacher Selection

ABSTRACT

In order to recognize and assess the qualities and qualifications of potential new faculty at the State University Agricultural and Technical College at Delhi, Vermont, a study was made to develop and implement faculty selection procedures through campus participation. The study involved a comprehensive review of the literature, consideration of industrial models of employee selection, surveying faculty to determine their characteristics and attitudes on new faculty selection, and polling students on their attitudes toward participation in the hiring of faculty. Three steps to a successful selection policy were noted: (1) knowledge of how to attract applicants; (2) a clear conception of what the job description is, and what qualities are necessary for satisfactory completion of the job; and (3) a means of assessing the candidate. The study indicated that a participational model of governance was best suited to implementing the policy. Recommendations outline the method of implementation of the selection process, with emphasis placed on the use of all available assessment techniques and structured interviews. Two unique recommendations were to use an initial group interview with the top candidates and to have each candidate teach one class session. The survey instruments and a bibliography are appended. (Author/MB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

- ED168659

CAMPUS PARTICIPATION IN THE DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION OF FACULTY SELECTION PROCEDURES

by

Dennis Callas, M.A.

State University Agricultural and Technical College
at Delhi, New York

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Dennis Callas

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

A PRACTICUM PRESENTED TO NOVA UNIVERSITY
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE
DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

NOVA UNIVERSITY

March 12, 1979

JC 790 244

ABSTRACT

NAME: Dennis Callas

CLUSTER: Vermont

MODULE: College Governance

PRACTICUM: CAMPUS PARTICIPATION IN THE DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION OF FACULTY SELECTION PROCEDURES

ABSTRACT: In order to recognize and assess the qualities and qualifications of potential new faculty at the State University Agricultural and Technical College at Delhi, a study was made to develop and implement faculty selection procedures through the use of campus participation. Procedures included a comprehensive review of the literature, which included consideration of industrial models of employee selection, and faculty and student surveys. The findings indicated that there are three steps to a successful selection policy: (1) knowledge of how to attract applicants; (2) a clear conception of what the job description is, together with the qualities and qualifications suited for satisfactory completion of such job; and (3) means of assessing, in the candidate, the qualities and qualifications sought. Further, the findings indicated that the participational model of governance was best suited to realize

the success of the practicum. Recommendations outlined the method of implementation, where emphasis was placed on the utilization of all available assessment techniques and structured interviews. Two unique recommendations were an initial group interview with the top candidates and having each candidate teach one class session.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	ii
LIST OF FIGURES	ii
Section	
1. INTRODUCTION	1
2. BACKGROUND AND SIGNIFICANCE	3
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE: DEVELOPMENT OF FACULTY SELECTION PROCEDURES	5
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE: IMPLEMENTATION OF FACULTY SELECTION PROCEDURES	14
3. PROCEDURES	18
DEFINITION OF TERMS	20
ASSUMPTIONS	21
LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY	21
4. RESULTS	23
5. DISCUSSION, IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	29
BIBLIOGRAPHY	38
APPENDIXES	
A. STUDENT SURVEY	41
B. FACULTY SURVEY	42
C. LETTER SENT TO SELECTED PERSONNEL DIRECTORS	46

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	Student Attitudes About Undergraduate Student Participation in Decisions on the Initial Hiring of Faculty	24
2	Status of Delhi's Faculty	25
3	Commitment to Two-Year Education	25
4	Knowledge of Two-Year Education	26
5	Faculty Attitudes About Students and Faculty Participation in Decision on the Initial Hiring of Faculty	27

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure		Page
1	Applicant Selection Matrix	11
2	A Comparison of Three Models of College Governance	16

SECTION 1: INTRODUCTION

Decisions as to recognizing and assessing the qualities and qualifications of potential faculty members from numerous applicants, and the final decision on who should be hired "probably influences the caliber of an institution of higher education more, over the long run, than any other category of governing decisions."[1] Yet, compared to industry, "the prevailing process of hiring faculty is amateurish"[2] and marked by the use of vague, subjective criteria.

If one were to ask today for an outline of the State University of New York Agricultural and Technical College at Delhi's faculty selection practices, he would most likely receive complaints concerning the lack or vagueness of such procedures, even though the decision to hire an individual reflects the academic stature of the College and, in turn, its ability to attract future personnel and students. Several interviews with administrators and faculty at Delhi have substantiated this, and have emphasized the need for the establishment of faculty selection procedures, by employing the expertise of the entire college community. Further, these interviews suggested the

---

[1] John J. Corson, The Governance of Colleges and Universities (Third edition; New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975), p. 190.

[2] Ibid, p. 192.

incorporation of any existing procedures, which have in the past been effective in selecting new faculty, into a new, comprehensive policy formulation.

The purpose of the practicum has therefore been to develop and implement a policy to improve the faculty selection procedures at Delhi through the use of campus participation. The enormity of this task was referred by Eurich in less than an optimistic tone when he stated that to meet the challenges ahead, such as the responsibility for the general education of all, colleges "will need good teachers--many more, I am afraid, than you can possibly find."[3]

Undaunted, the writer used a survey design to carry out the investigation. More specifically, a comprehensive review of the literature, as well as faculty and student surveys at Delhi, were used in the development and implementation of faculty selection procedures.

---

[3]Stephen M. Poort, Guidelines for the Recruitment and Selection of Community College Faculty, U.S. Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 058 868, 1971.

SECTION 2: BACKGROUND AND SIGNIFICANCE

The strength of a two-year college program is to a large extent directly proportional to the expertise and commitment to excellence of its faculty. As one two-year college's faculty handbook states: In a very real sense the faculty is the college, and what the faculty does or fails to do makes Fullerton Junior College."[4] This is certainly true at Delhi, and undoubtedly true elsewhere.

The process and decisions for faculty choice, however, are difficult, and in a time of declines in student enrollment, accountability and economic austerity, these decisions become even more difficult. Due to the complexity and lack of procedures of how to select the best personnel at Delhi, a participational model of governance was used in the development of the practicum to determine a consensus "through interaction and influence in a group decision-making process,"[5] to simplify and make more accurate the selection process. This practicum then relates to the subject matter of the module in that both

---

[4] Harold F. Landrith, Introduction to the Community Junior College (Illinois: The Interstate Printers and Publishers, 1971), p. 184.

[5] Richard C. Richardson Jr., "The Participational Model of Governance," Paper presented at the A.A.J.C. Annual Meeting (October 23, 1978), p. 3.

the practicum and module are oriented towards decision-making within a model of governance, as it occurs in the two-year setting.

The significance of the practicum then would be the development and implementation of the first campus-wide plan to employ the best available personnel, and hence strengthen the image of the College as a leading two-year academic institution. Without such an image, the College could not hope to attract the best faculty the institution could support, nor would it hope to attract students contemplating coming to Delhi. The latter is significant when considering projected enrollment drops of 19 percent by 1990.[6]

The practicum would also be significant to the College in that most faculty, at least on the national level, are not changing jobs, but rather staying indefinitely at their present position.[7] This underlines the need for choosing the best available personnel, as in all probability new appointees would remain on the job for many years. To continue these thoughts further, the decision to hire an individual and later award tenure to a faculty member with, say, "30 to 35 productive years ahead involves a total economic commitment of between 750,000

---

[6]Jack Magarrel, "The Enrollment Roller Coaster: Colleges Fear the Big Dip," Chronicle of Higher Education (September 5, 1978), p. 1.

[7]Malcolm G. Scully, "Academic Musical Chairs: Many Say the Game's Ending," Chronicle of Higher Education (October 23, 1978), p. 1.

and one million dollars"[8] by the College. The mere costs of maintaining faculty mandates a serious attempt by the institution to determine procedures for selecting only the best applicants.

Finally, the practicum has followed the maxim that the best institutions have the best faculty; assuming this to be true, then the implications of the practicum should have a significant impact on the College.

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE: DEVELOPMENT OF FACULTY SELECTION PROCEDURES[9]

At Delhi, as at most colleges and universities of the state system of New York, initial recommendations are usually reached "on the basis of peer evaluation by departmental faculty, whose own professional competence renders them best suited to judge the person being considered,"[10] as well as by appropriate Division Deans and the Vice-President of Academic Affairs. These recommendations appear before the President who, in turn, recommends to the Chancellor. These procedures are outlined in Article II, Title A of the policies of the Board of Trustees of the State University of New York:

> The chief administrative officer of a college, after seeking consultation, may appoint, reappoint, or recommend to the Chancellor for appointment or re-

---

[8] Clifton R. Wharton, Jr., "Chancellor's Agenda: Who Will Teach?" The News (October, 1978), p. 4.

[9] Included in this subsection were those comments solicited from the campus community at Delni; results of the faculty and student surveys are reported in section 4.

[10] Wharton, op. cit., p. 4.

> appointment, as may be appropriate to the nature of appointment provided for herein, such persons as are, in his judgement, best qualified. Such appointments shall be consistent with the operating requirements of the college. For purposes of this Article, the term "consultation" shall mean consideration by the chief administrative officer of a college of recommendations of academic or professional employees, including the committees, if any, of the appropriate department or professional area, and other appropriate sources in connection with appointment or reappointment of a specified employee; provided, however, that nothing contained herein shall prevent the chief administrative officer of a college from taking such action as he may deem necessary to meet notice requirements in the event of nonrenewal of term appointment.[11]

Aside from Chancellor Wharton's stressing the importance of "a thorough professional review"[12] for hiring at the State University of New York, each unit of the state system is allowed by the above mandate to interpret its own optimum means of faculty selection. But beyond regulations and intent, each unit has not presently generated a consistent policy statement for all programs in the selection of new employees.

There are three steps in a successful selection policy: (1) knowledge of how to attract applicants;[13] (2) a clear conception of what the job description is, together with the qualities and qualifications suited for satisfactory completion of such job; and (3) means of assessing, in the candidate, the

---

[11]State University of New York, Policies of the Board of Trustees (New York: 1977), p. 11.

[12]Wharton, op. cit., p. 4.

[13]This step has only been briefly discussed in the practicum; see section 3, page 21 for further details on why the discussion has been limited to a few brief remarks.

qualities and qualifications sought.

Blau states that "the average salaries in academic institutions exert more influence than anything else on the formal qualifications of their faculties,"[14] while Marsh and Stafford believe that faculty are more interested in intrinsic rewards, as well as nonmonetary extrinsic ones, such as location.[15] The image of the College also "defines the receptivity of potential applicants"[16] and influences the College more over the long run, than any other factor.

The second step in a successful selection policy relates to the actual job description, together with the characteristics needed to carry it out. This step is essential when attempting to assess the candidate's potential, although the Grigg vs. Duke Power case made it clear that "standards not validated against job success are unlawful."[17] Specifications should then distinguish "between the 'essential' qualifications necessary to do a job and those which may be 'desirable' or 'preferable';"[18] but in all cases be related to successful completion of job tasks.

---

[14]Peter M. Blau, The Organization of Academic Work (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1973), p. 81.

[15]John F. Marsh, Jr., and Frank P. Stafford, "The Effects of Values on Pecuniary Behavior," American Sociological Review (1967), pp. 740-754.

[16]William C. Byham, and Morton Edward Spitzer, The Law and Personnel Testing (American Management Association, Inc., 1971), p. 42.

[17]Ibid., p. 47.

[18]General Electric Company, Employment Office Model (General Electric, 1978), p. 6.

What is needed is a written program enumerating selection needs and qualifications to accomplish institutional goals. As years pass, the criteria could change as well, hence the establishment of a committee to continually evaluate job specifications should assure accuracy.[19]

The employer is oftentimes interested in the technical qualifications of the applicant. McSherry at I.B.M. has found that people with exceptional academic backgrounds and high grade point averages in college are the most successful workers.[20] A.T. & T. also relies on the academic achievement of its candidates for predicting eventual success; research at A.T. & T. over the years has confirmed this correlation.[21] In Japan, however, employers are usually interested in character qualifications rather than the technical abilities of the applicant. Japanese employers, for instance, are provided information on the socio-economic background of the applicant, his personality and even ideological beliefs, to determine character qualifications.[22] Brawer, however, concluded that the successful teacher is one who: (1) enjoys working; (2) resolves own personal problems, or at least is confident of resolving such

---

[19]Ibid.

[20]Statement by Edward McSherry, assistant director of employment at I.B.M., telephone interview, Armonk, New York, December 13, 1978.

[21]Stan Luxenberg, "Education at A.T. & T.," Change (December/January, 1978/79), pp. 26-35.

[22]Koya Azumi, Higher Education and Business Recruitment in Japan (New York: Teachers College Press, 1969), p. 75.

problems; (3) enjoys students and relates well with them; (4) is a mature, mentally stable individual; (5) is creative; and (6) is not egotistical.[23] Richardson has also stated that the two-year faculty member, to be effective, must realize and accept the special character of two-year students.[24]

The most important and complex step is the means of recognizing and assessing the qualities and qualifications sought in an applicant. The key assessment tool is that of the interview. Research in selection interviewing indicates that an "unstructured interview is of little value, is generally unreliable, and is not helpful in assuring that information is consistently gathered."[25]

Short and Taber believe that (1) the interview should be structured, and be the same with each person applying for the same position; (2) areas to be covered in the interview should include motivation to work, personal-social relations, mental abilities, self-confidence, effectiveness of expression, and sociability;[26] (3) questions could influence the applicant's response and hence should be worded properly by the interviewer; (4) the interviewer must control the interview, be prepared to

---

[23]Charles R. Monroe, Profile of the Community College (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1972), p. 253.

[24]Ibid., p. 255.

[25]Lawrence O. Short and Lynville E. Taber, "The Selection Interview: An Interim Approach," Public Personnel Management (March/April, 1978), p. 143.

[26]See R. A. Fear, The Evaluation Interview (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973) for additional areas to be covered.

listen, respect the viewpoints of the interviewer, be acquainted with the qualities and qualifications sought, have questions prepared prior to the interview, as well as place the interviewer at ease; (5) the interviewer must avoid conflict, stereotyping, prejudice, being overly positive or negative with the interviewee; and (6) the interviewer need not be professionally trained. The literature, however, contains support for both positions, as to whether the interviewer should be professionally trained or not.[27]

Dr. Webster of McGill University and Dr. Carlson and Dr. Mayfield of the Life Insurance Agency Management Association have "demonstrated the susceptibility of the interview to factors unrelated to either the applicant's interview behavior or his potential for job success."[28] Frequently, the interview is influenced by the interviewer more than by any other variable, and hence the research suggests multiple interviews with different interviewers.

Assessment must, of course, be validated and reliable. Records must be maintained on all levels. For instance, at the selection stage, the evaluators should have a standard form to fill out (see Figure 1), so that accurate comparisons could be made among the applicants. To ensure further reliability, "every major question should be written to provide a structure or general framework for the interview and allow for uniformity

---

[27]Short and Taber, op. cit., p. 147.

[28]Byham and Spitzer, op. cit., p. 94.

FIGURE 1

Applicant Selection Matrix

Evaluation Scale

outstanding - 5
excellent - 4
good - 3
average - 2
marginal - 1

		Education 25%			Job Knowledge 40%			General Characteristics 35%				
Must/		Doctorate Degree	Grade Point Average	Knowledge of...	Knowledge of...	Knowledge of Different...	Effective Written and Oral Communications	Interpersonal Skills	General Philosophy of Education	Marginal Potential	Attire	Total
Preferred		P								P		
Weight Factor		.15	.10	.15	.15	.10	.10	.05	.05	.10	.05	
Applicant	A											
	B											
	C											

Source: The above matrix is a variation on the one found in the Personnel Journal, August 1978, p. 425; "The Balanced Approach to Successful Screening Interviews," by Jack Bucalo.

11

to assure consistency when interviewing more than one applicant for the same job,"[29] and each response noted on standard forms. As for the validity of assessment techniques, federal courts have indicated a "willingness to accept both rational validity (i.e., common sense judgements--writer's note) and criterion-related validity as acceptable evidence to justify the use of tests,"[30] and/or other means of assessment.

Assessing applicants includes, beyond the interview, reviewing their personal vitae, transcripts and references. At Kishwaukee College in Illinois, the teacher assessment process also includes an initial interview in which the top three condidates are interviewed as a group, as well as having each candidate teach one class session.[31]

The latter form of assessment was pioneered by A.T. & T. Assessment centers, as they are called, include group discussions, business games and simulations to measure the suitability of an applicant with respect to communication skills, stress factors and the ability to work at a specific job.[32] "Each year the company assesses about 30,000 people,"[33] including

---

[29]General Electric Company, op. cit., p. 20.

[30]Byham and Spitzer, op. cit., p. 105.

[31]John Tidgewell and Dan Kralik, Teacher Selection: A Unique Approach to Select Career Instructors, U.S. Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document EJ 105 421, 1975.

[32]Manuel London, "What Every Personnel Director Should Know About Management Promotion Decisions," Personnel Journal (October, 1978), p. 553.

[33]Luxenberg, op. cit., p. 35.

job applicants and candidates for promotion. Assessment centers are utilized also at Standard Oil of Ohio, General Electric and Sears, but mostly for managerial-level applicants.

On the other hand, many non-managerial applicants are assessed by means of tests. The major types of industrial tests are the intelligence tests, skill tests, and dexterity tests. While historically education has been nearly void of such testing techniques, recent years have seen a gradual infiltration of testing methods. For instance, the Teacher Perceiver Interview, which supposedly differentiates the good from poor teachers, is already used in nearly all the school districts of Columbus, Ohio.[34] Brawer has also developed a teacher discriminator called Functional Potential, which "seems to suggest a valid way to assess people in ways beyond those of the usual demographic reports."[35] Finally, Pratt has endorsed the use of the California F Scale, as his research indicates "that personality assessment of teacher applicants is a valuable segment of the screening process."[36]

In the final analysis, selection criteria for two-year

---

[34]Donald L. Haefele, "The Teacher Perceiver Interview: How Valid?", Phi Delta Kappan (June, 1978), p. 683.

[35]Florence B. Brawer, Functional Potential: A New Approach to Viewing Faculty, Topical Paper No. 57 (Los Angeles: ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges, October, 1976), p. 42.

[36]George L. B. Pratt, Flexibility of Personality As It Relates to the Hiring and Retention of Public Community College Faculty in New York State (New York: New York University, 1966), page unknown.

faculty must be unique to the particular institution. Although the current research links certain criteria to an efficient selection process, there is enough disagreement among the researchers to have each institution determine, as best it can, the process best suited for the college.

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE: IMPLEMENTATION OF FACULTY SELECTION PROCEDURES

"On almost any campus, the processes of campus governance are dictated largely by intuition, irrational precedent, and from-the-hip responses, with perhaps a tiny fraction based on fact."[37] Although the major appeal of using a participational model of governance is one of logic, there is no hard data that "the concept of shared authority actually works."[38] In fact, scholars such as Baldridge are committed to the political model of governance,[39] while Priest favors the bureaucratic model, as it encourages administrators "to act as leaders making decisions--not ambivalent, pseudo-democratic pawns in a power game using education as a vehicle."[40] (See Figure 2 for a compari-

---

[37]Harold L. Hodgkinson, Campus Governance: The Amazing Thing Is That It Works At All, Report No. 11 (Washington, D. C.: ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education, July, 1971), p. 1.

[38]Ibid., p. 9.

[39]J. Victor Baldridge, "Models of University Governance: Bureaucratic, Collegial, and Political" (California: Stanford University Center for Research and Development in Teaching, September, 1971), p. 7. (mimeographed.)

[40]Bill J. Priest, "Governance Structures for the 70's: A Participational, Transitional, Traditional Viewpoint" (For A.A.J.C. Panel on February 28, 1972), p. 3. (mimeographed.)

son of these three models of college governance.)

The literature, however, generally indicates that participation by faculty and students should be utilized in the faculty selection process, although the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education does not "favor having students serving on appointment committees."[41] Centra, on the other hand, indicates that there is no evidence that faculty or administrators' judgements are more reliable than students' judgements; Centra also states that teachers could oftentimes better evaluate a new applicant's qualifications and knowledge of a subject than an administrator.[42]

The implementation of a participational model of governance requires a significant commitment by trustees, administrators, faculty and students to decentralize authority and redesign patterns of accountability, thereby requiring campus attitudes to change to one encompassing interdependency. "New institutions seeking to implement a participational model (might) have to wait three years to see major differences in performance. Established institutions (might) require a minimum of five years for significant attitudinal changes."[43]

Keeton warns that initially the implementation of a shared model of authority could increase stress and role ambiguity

---

[41]Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, Governance of Higher Education (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973), p. 69.

[42]See J. A. Centra, "Colleagues as Raters of Classroom Instruction," Journal of Higher Education 46,(May/June, 1975).

[43]Richardson, op. cit., pp. 6-7.

FIGURE 2

A Comparison of Three Models of College Governance

	Political Model	Bureaucratic Model	Collegial Model
Basic Image	Political system	Hierarchical bureaucracy	Professional community
Basic Theoretical Foundations	Conflict theory Interest group theory Open-systems theory Community power theory	Weber's bureaucratic model Classical formal systems model	Human relations approach to organizations Literature on professionalism
Change Processes	Primary concern	Minor concern	Minor concern
Conflict	Viewed as normal; key to analysis of policy influence	Viewed as abnormal; to be controlled by bureaucratic sanctions	Viewed as abnormal; eliminated in a "true community of scholars"
Social Structure	Pluralistic; fractured by subcultures and divergent interest groups	Unitary; integrated by the formal bureaucracy	Unitary; united by the "community of scholars"
Legislative Process (i.e., decision making)	Negotiation, bargaining, and political influence processes	Rationalistic, formal bureaucratic procedures	Shared, collegial decisions
Policy	Emphasis on formulation	Emphasis on execution	Unclear; probably more emphasis on formulation

Source: J. Victor Baldridge, "Models of University Governance: Bureaucratic, Collegial, and Political" (California: Stanford University Center for Research and Development in Teaching, September, 1971), p. 13. (mimeographed.)

among staff.[44] A firm commitment, under the strong leadership of the administration, should however lessen the impact of change on the staff.

Although the president of the College and the trustees, under the participational model of governance, would still have final approval of faculty appointments, faculty and students would play a major part in the selection process. In summary, implementing selection procedures through a shared-authority model must have (1) the support of administration, (2) the willingness of faculty and students to participate, (3) a written statement describing the strategy of assessing applicants for the qualities and qualifications suited for satisfactory completion of job requirements, and (4) a second written statement detailing who should participate in each stage of the assessment model.

---

[44]See Morris Keeton and others, Shared Authority on Campus (Washington: American Association for Higher Education, 1971).

SECTION 3: PROCEDURES

The procedures that were followed in the development and implementation of faculty selection procedures included (1) a comprehensive review of the literature; (2) consideration of industrial models of employee selection, such as those at I.B.M. and General Electric; (3) eliciting recommendations from the faculty, administration and students at Delhi, through informal meetings; (4) polling students to determine their attitudes toward student participation in the initial hiring of faculty (see Appendix A); (5) surveying faculty to determine their status with respect to tenure, commitment to two-year education, background, and views on the selection of new faculty (see Appendix B); (6) developing and implementing a policy for faculty selection, through the analysis of the previous procedures and (7) submission of the final product to both the Vice-President of Academic Affairs and the Affirmative Action Officer at Delhi.

The two surveys indicated whether or not students and faculty <u>wanted</u> to participate in the initial hiring of faculty, and hence determined the scope of the participational model developed in the practicum. Further, the faculty survey determined general faculty characteristics at Delhi, present staff commitment to two-year education, their knowledge of and

experience with two-year colleges, and views on the selection of new faculty.

The significance of such data was threefold. First, it showed the potential mobility of the staff at Delhi. Recent research results indicated that, unlike the past, fewer faculty members are leaving their positions voluntarily,[45] and hence suggested that the selection process make certain new appointees are well qualified and commited to the mission of the two-year educational system, as in all probability future appointees would remain on the job for many years.

Secondly, the survey determined whether existing selection procedures at Delhi had, in the past, attracted faculty commited to two-year education, as well as being knowledgeable about the two-year system. When results indicated this to be so, such existing procedures were determined and incorporated into the policy statement generated by the practicum. Thirdly, the survey attempted to determine whether or not faculty at the College wanted prospective teachers to give lectures prior to being offered a position, in determining how effective a classroom teacher they would possibly be. This idea for evaluation is one often used in industrial models of employee selection and was adapted to higher education for the practicum.[46]

The data collected for the two surveys were translated

---

[45]Scully, op. cit., p. 1.

[46]See Seymour Adler, "Using Assessment Centers in Smaller Organizations," Personnel Journal (September, 1978), pp. 484-487 and p. 516.

into simple percentages; e.g., X percent of the students polled did not want to participate in faculty appointment. The polling was, however, complicated in its design and different for faculty and students. Since there are 138 faculty members at Delhi, every attempt was made to poll every faculty member. The procedure included an initial mailing of the questionnaire, with cover letter, followed by a second mailing at the end of two weeks, when it was necessary. Students, totaling 2,700, were sampled by means of a stratified random sampling technique. The actual sample size was 200, selected by sex, division, and freshman/senior ranking.

Since parts of these surveys were used in several Carnegie Commission on Higher Education reports,[47] it was assumed that the reliability and validity of these surveys had been established. To ensure further accuracy of the results, a pilot test was run to test for ambiguity, poorly-worded questions, poor instructions, and other factors causing the possible failure of the tests. The pilot test did not include faculty or students at Delhi, so as not to bias the final survey; the pilot test was administered to ten people not affiliated with the College.

DEFINITION OF TERMS

1. Assessment Centers: Centers, in industries, where specially

---

[47] See Leland L. Medsker and Dale Tillery, Breaking the Access Barriers (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971). Also see Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, Governance of Higher Education (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973).

trained individuals assess applicants as they perform multi-simulated duties for positions to be filled. In education, assessment centers are classrooms where administrators, faculty and students observe and assess an applicant teaching a class or giving a seminar.

2. Campus Participation: The active involvement of administrators, faculty and students in the development and implementation of faculty selection procedures. For purposes of the practicum, the term "involvement" means campus input through interviews and surveys to help formulate the final product, as well as membership on committees for the actual selection of applicants.

3. Collegial Model of Governance: It is the same as the participational model of governance; i.e., shared-authority model.

ASSUMPTIONS

It was assumed that an affirmative action plan is in operation at the College, and hence the framework for developing and implementing faculty selection procedures is already unbiased. Further, it was assumed that recruitment methods at the College are capable of yielding a pool of qualified applicants, including minority groups. It is due to these assumptions that the writer avoided lengthy discussions with regard to fair hiring practices and means of attracting possible candidates to the College.

It was also assumed that industrial models for selection of applicants were not only possible to duplicate in higher education, but applicable as well.

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

Although there were several limitations of this project, the key limitation was the realization that no one policy formulation could guarantee the selection of the best faculty member

from a pool of applicants. Rather, because of the numerous variables affecting selection criteria, the best one could hope for was to minimize error factors. For instance, although there was not a unique set of criteria for discriminating between good and poor instructors, the literature suggested multiple assessment techniques, under control conditions, to avoid major errors in the interpretation of a candidate's abilities.

The lack of information on selection procedures in education was another limitation of the study. Although the literature abounds with information on affirmative action, little is written about the actual selection process. Finally, not all industries responded to the writer's request for information on their selection policy (see Appendix C), and hence limited the scope and depth of the practicum.

SECTION 4: RESULTS

The findings, determined by a comprehensive review of the literature, which included reviewing industrial models of employee selection, and the recommendations solicited from the campus community, revealed that there are three formal steps to a successful faculty selection policy. First, the knowledge of how to attract applicants to the College. Secondly, a clear, concise formulation of what the job description is, together with the qualities and qualifications suited for satisfactory completion of job requirements. Thirdly, the means to assess, in the candidate, the qualities and qualifications sought.

The literature also described three basic models of governance for implementing faculty selection procedures. The bureaucratic model, which relies on the judgement of a few administrators; the shared-authority model of governance that defers decisions until the full participation of all members of the academic community reach a consensus; and the political model which is a conflict resolution type model.

The faculty survey analysis included 88 percent of the faculty, while the student survey sampled 200 students. The latter survey was compiled by means of a stratified random sampling technique, using sex, division and freshman/senior ranking as characteristics to generate a sample representative

of the population.

Percentages were tabulated to test whether there was a significant difference among faculty or students in answering certain questions related to the objectives of the practicum (see Appendices A and B). The analysis showed, for instance, that approximately 40 percent of the students surveyed desire voting power on committees for faculty selection. A majority, however, favored less than such a voting role. Interestingly, these results are somewhat similar to those gathered by the Carnegie Commission's Report on the governance of higher education, 1973 (see Table 1).

TABLE 1

Student Attitudes About Undergraduate Student Participation In Decisions On The Initial Hiring Of Faculty

	Delhi Survey	Carnegie Commission Survey[48]
Control	5.0%	1.0%
Voting power on committees	38.5%	21.0%
Formal consultation	15.0%	26.0%
Informal consultation	20.0%	28.0%
Little or no role	20.0%	24.0%
Other	1.5%	

Responses to questions 1, 2, and 3 of the faculty survey indicated a majority of faculty members at Delhi have continuing appointment; approximately 83 percent are fifty years old or younger; and 50 percent have been at the College for over six years (see Table 2). Further responses to the survey, outlined

[48] Undergraduates were sampled in 189 institutions, some of which were two-year colleges.

TABLE 2

Status Of Delhi's Faculty

(A) Faculty Age:		(B) Years Employed at Delhi:	
Under 30	10%	Under 3 years	23%
Between 30 and 50	73%	Between 3 and 6 years	27%
Over 50	17%	Over 6 years	50%

(C) Faculty with Continuing Appointment:

Yes, have continuing appointment	59%
No	41%

TABLE 3

Commitment To Two-Year Education

	Faculty Preference To Work Elsewhere	Faculty Who Would Consider Sending Their Children To A Two-Year College
Yes	10.0%	81.5%
No	65.0%	3.5%
Uncertain	22.0%	5.0%
Not Applicable		10.0%
Other	3.0%	

in Table 3, showed that a majority of faculty do not prefer to work at a four-year college or in industry; Medsker and Tillery in a 1971 Carnegie supported study found only 53.8 percent of community college faculty actually preferring employment at a two-year college, significantly less than the 65 percent at Delhi. Table 3 also indicates that 81.5 percent of Delhi's faculty would consider sending their children to a two-year college, with only 3.5 percent stating categorically that they would not.

Faculty insight into the two-year educational system, with respect to questions 6 and 7 of the survey, revealed upon analysis of the responses that only 34 percent of the present faculty attended a two-year college and just 11 percent were ever employed at a two-year college. Table 4 also indicates that 49 percent of the faculty completed one or more courses on two-year colleges; a further breakdown of the 49 percent showed that only 16 percent took such courses prior to employment at Delhi.

TABLE 4

Knowledge Of Two-Year Education

	Faculty Who Attended A Two-Year College	Faculty Employed At A Two-Year College, Prior to Delhi	Faculty Who Completed A Course(s) On Two-Year Colleges
Had	34.0%	11.0%	49.0%
Had not	66.0%	84.0%	47.5%
Response omitted		5.0%	3.5%

Although faculty strongly suggested involvement in the decisions on the initial hiring of faculty, few wanted to share those decisions with students (see Table 5); the Carnegie Commission's Report on the governance of higher education, in 1973, revealed similar results. Table 5 also shows that many faculty favored formal or informal consultation, but unlike student responses, few wanted voting or total control over decisions on appointment of faculty.

TABLE 5

Faculty Attitudes About Students And Faculty Participation In Decisions On The Initial Hiring Of Faculty

	Student Participation	Faculty Participation
Control	0%	13.5%
Voting power on committees	5.0%	19.0%
Formal consultation	10.0%	41.5%
Informal consultation	16.0%	13.5%
Little or no role	69.0%	10.0%
Other		2.5%

The last question of the faculty survey attempted to gauge the mood of faculty towards assessing possible new faculty, by means of having each candidate teach one class session or give a seminar. The results showed only 24.5 percent of the faculty who wanted candidates to perform and be evaluated in the classroom, while 22 percent were uncertain, and 53.5 percent said no to the idea.

Some faculty questioned whether the assessment technique could fairly discriminate between candidates with or without teaching experience. Others were doubtful of how practical it

was, mentioning the time needed to evaluate each candidate. These queries by some of the staff seem to have been factors related to the faculty rejection of the idea.

Overall, the surveys revealed an interest by faculty and students to participate in the hiring of new faculty. Faculty were, however, reluctant about student involvement in the decision-making process. Finally, the literature search and review of industrial models of employee selection outlined suggested designs for the development and implementation of faculty selection procedures; the three basic models for the selection process were the bureaucratic model of governance, the shared-authority model, and the political model.

SECTION 5: DISCUSSION, IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

With the current ambiguity in the faculty selection process at Delhi, and the oversupply of teachers on the market, it is imperative that the best personnel be selected. When less than the best are hired, especially in a time when few faculty members intend to leave Delhi voluntarily,[49] students are subjected to less than adequate instruction, and the College's reputation is diminished.

The faculty survey implied that although the present system has structural inadequacies and/or omissions, such as not measuring a candidate's knowledge of and experience with two-year colleges,[50] it does possess many redeemable features. For instance, the survey indicated Delhi's faculty to be committed both to their job and the mission of the two-year college. That so many staff members do not prefer to work elsewhere, and are

---

[49]This was based on the faculty survey and national indicators. The responses to questions 1, 2, and 3 of the survey showed most faculty at Delhi having tenure, with at least six years of employment at the College; the responses to question 4 indicated most faculty not interested in working elsewhere. Finally, national statistics, mentioned earlier, revealed few faculty changing jobs.

[50]This is not a local problem. In Medsker and Tillery's national study, approximately 8 percent of the staff surveyed had been students in a two-year college for one year or less, and another 20 percent had been students for more than one year. Only one-third had taken one or more courses dealing with two-year colleges. In today's job market, there seems to be no reason why these figures could not be increased.

also committed enough to send their own children to a two-year college, raises a question as to what aspect in the present selection process attracts these individuals. At this point, it is not at all clear.

The surveys further indicated a strong desire of faculty and students to participate in the selection process, although faculty were reluctant about student involvement. Faculty did not want to "take-over" the decision making process, but rather showed a willingness to have the opportunity to participate in the selection process. This conservative attitude of the staff possibly reflects their realization of the legality of the chief administrative officer's right to recommend appointments to the Chancellor.

Faculty were also reluctant to have each candidate for a position teach one class session or give a seminar. Interviews with staff indicated that the assessment technique might be acceptable if: (1) every effort is made to prepare the candidate for teaching the class; (2) evaluators recognize that this might be an anxious time for the candidate; (3) adequate time is allotted for a fair assessment, such as a full class period; (4) students are notified of the new lecturer in advance, and are told the reason for the visit; (5) every effort is made to take into consideration the differences between an applicant straight from graduate school and one with several years of teaching experience; and (6) classroom assessments are only one factor in the total evaluation of the candidate's abilities.

Selecting the best faculty is complex, deserving a great

deal of time and effort for those concerned. The literature and industrial model stressed the use of all available assessment techniques, in hopes of lessening the error factor. Using unstructured interviews, and few and loosely defined assessment tools, only increases the probability of choosing the wrong applicant.

While the participational model of governance is not error free, it does permit the academic community to share their expertise in the selection of faculty. Again the literature emphasized how each group could better evaluate certain aspects of the applicant's qualities and qualifications. For instance, faculty might better judge technical qualifications; students, the ability of the applicant to communicate on their "level"; and administrators might lend additional insight into how the applicant fits into the total mission and goals of the College.

The literature also indicated that to implement procedures for faculty selection, using the participational model of governance, requires a significant commitment of support from the trustees and administration. Once this commitment is made, however, faculty and students would be given the chance to participate actively in the search for the best personnel, and administrators given the means to assess more accurately among candidates. The impact on the College, in general, would be to strengthen the image of the College as a leading two-year institution.

Using the shared-authority model in the selection process, therefore, decreases the risk in hiring, as it increases the

number of inputs in the assessment. The human inputs, while fallible, help gather relevant data to base an honest and as accurate as possible decision.

It is in this spirit that the following recommendations are submitted:

(1) Program committees, consisting of at least two members from within the discipline, one of which is the Program Director, and the Dean of the Division, along with the Affirmative Action Officer's support, select the candidates to be interviewed on campus. Screening of applicants would include a thorough analysis of transcripts, especially with respect to grade point averages and courses taken. Although research at A.T. & T. has confirmed a direct correlation between grades and successful employment, this should only be a single factor in the total evaluation process. This is important as success in industry oftentimes refers to the "adaptibility" and "trainability" of a candidate, unlike education, which hires to fulfill specific job descriptions, that are unlikely to change. Within the current period of declines in student enrollment and economic austerity, however, the College might prefer an individual that can in fact adapt to changes in conditions of employment, and hence the industrial correlation between grades and successful employment would also be applicable to academia.

The initial screening process should yield only three to five top candidates. Further assessment at this time would include reviewing the completed application form, as well as telephone reference checks. It is also recommended that applicants submit an essay, for instance, on the missions and goals of two-

year education in the year 2000; assessment of writing skills and philosophy would then be measurable.

Records must maintained, preferably, using standard forms similar to Figure 1.

(2) The top candidates are telephoned and "invited for an interview on a predetermined date. The interview process and supporting philosophy are explained. A special point is made to explain the procedure of observing the candidate while teaching (Delhi) students,"[51] and the group interview.

"If the candidate agrees to participate in the selection process, he/she is given the name phone numbers of the instructor who teaches the class in which the candidate will teach."[52] Every effort must be made to make the candidate comfortable with the selection process. Emphasis should be placed on the importance of teaching effectiveness at Delhi. It should also be pointed out to the applicant that one lecture could not adequately assess the applicant's full potential, and therefore the teaching practicum is just one aspect of the evaluation process.

(3) The Program Director and faculty (faculty could include anyone interested in the selection process; i.e., not directly involved in the particular discipline for which the applicant is seeking employment) meet with all candidates for a group interview, at the beginning of the on-campus interview. Tidgewell

---

[51] Tidgewell and Kralik, op. cit., p. 42.

[52] Ibid.

and Kralik indicated that after the first few minutes, applicants become relaxed and some even appreciate "seeing the competition."[53]

The purpose of the group interview is "to obtain a preliminary idea of each candidate's general attitudes about education and his professional objectives."[54] The evaluators should also observe interaction between the candidates, encouraging a humorous, relaxed atmosphere.

During this period, each candidate should be given the day's activities, detailing when and where interviews are to take place. Candidates could again reassemble during lunch, with the Program Director and staff.

This initial interview would reduce much of the time needed to inform each of the applicants separately of the general philosophy of the College and program, as well as the day's schedule. Further, it gives a unique opportunity for the evaluator to make comparisons among the different personalities and opinions of the applicants. Again, records must maintained and major questions and statements determined before the group interview.

(4) An opportunity for the Division Dean and Vice-President of Academic Affairs to interview the applicants separately should be set aside. Both administrators should fill out standard forms, so as to be fair and consistent with each of the applicants.

---

[53]Ibid., p. 44.

[54]Ibid., p. 42; Professor D. Morales of Delhi also supplied additional insight into the benefits of the group interview.

The Program Director and faculty should also interview each of the candidates separately. Program faculty, to ensure reliability, must interview all candidates, and not have different members of staff interviewing different applicants.

Candidates should have different interviewing schedules, so as to reduce long waits; i.e., do not have all applicants waiting to be interviewed separately by the Vice-President at 10 o'clock.

(5) The Program Director or his designee is to escort each applicant to each of the interview stages. Free time should be included on the day's agenda, giving the applicant a chance to assess for himself the campus, staff, and students. At the end of the day's activity (see Recommendation No. 7), the candidate is to be asked for any impressions with respect to the institution.

(6) The teaching practicum should be evaluated not only by the Program Director or his designee, but also by students. At the end of the class period, with the candidate then leaving for the next appointment, students would be asked to either fill out a standard form and/or respond directly; due to students attending other classes, the teaching practicum might be curtailed a few minutes before the hour, to guarantee adequate time for responses from the students.

Students should be notified in advance of the new lecturer, and why they are to evaluate the applicant's teaching effectiveness. Similar to the industrial assessment centers, students are to be encouraged to approximate the kind of class situation

the applicant would find once employed at the College; e.g., to raise questions and express their opinion, even when it might differ from the lecturer's.

During summer holiday, the teaching practicum would be a seminar, evaluated by appropriate faculty.

(7) At the end of the day's activity, each candidate is interviewed briefly by the program staff. It is at this point where any final questions are asked, as well as hearing the candidate's impressions of the College and the interviewing process. The latter is one method to rectify any problems inherent with the procedures outlined so far.

(8) In a joint meeting of faculty, Program Director and the Division Dean, the top candidate is chosen. All pertinent records, including the applicant's classroom evaluation, and a written rationale for the choice, should be submitted to the Vice-President of Academic Affairs. The Vice-President, upon the recommendation of the joint committee and his own evaluation of all candidates, submits to the President his top candidate for final approval.

Whenever the Vice-President or President does not chose the joint committee's top candidate, a written explanation should be given.

(9) Once the College is committed to the above recommendations, workshops should be given to staff, especially Program Directors and Division Deans, detailing the principles and method of implementation discussed in the practicum. Each program should then be charged with writing major questions to be asked of can-

didates, overall selection needs and the qualifications sought to accomplish program and institutional goals. The criteria should then be reassessed every year. Final products, such as the applicant selection matrix (see Figure 1), should be generated in detail by each program.

While programs might be provincial in terms of needs and goals, the Long Range Planning Committee of the College Assembly should be given the charge of analyzing how program and institutional goals might co-exist. For instance, the Committee could relate needs in several disciplines, and recommend hiring an applicant to share teaching duties in, say, mathematics and physics. At all times, a working relationship must be established between the Long Range Committee and each program.

The Affirmative Action Officer would be in charge of overseeing both committees, making sure state and federal guidelines are followed.

Realizing the enormity of the task, the above recommendations outline the potential for improvement in the selection of faculty. Utilizing all available assessment techniques, structured interviews and the knowledge of what the job description is, together with the qualities and qualifications suited for satisfactory completion of such job, reduces the chances of choosing the wrong applicant. To put it another way, without a general fremework for the selection of faculty, allowing for uniformity to assure accuracy, the selection process becomes a poor risk.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adler, Seymour. "Using Assessment Centers in Smaller Organizations," Personnel Journal. September, 1978.

Azumi, Koya. Higher Education and Business Recruitment in Japan. New York: Teachers College Press, 1969.

Baldridge, J. Victor. "Models of University Governance: Bureaucratic, Collegial, and Political." California: Stanford University Center for Research and Development in Teaching, September, 1971. (Mimeographed.)

Blau, Peter M. The Organization of Academic Work. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1973.

Brawer, Florence B. Functional Potential: A New Approach to Viewing Faculty, Topical Paper No. 57. Los Angeles: ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges, October, 1976.

Bucalo, Jack. "The Balanced Approach to Successful Screening Interviews," Personnel Journal, August, 1978.

Byham, William C., and Spitzer, Morton Edward. The Law and Personnel Testing. American Management Association, Inc., 1971.

Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. Governance of Higher Education. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973.

Centra, J. A. "Colleagues as Raters of Classroom Instruction," Journal of Higher Education 46. May/June, 1975.

Corson, John J. The Governance of Colleges and Universities. Third edition. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975.

Fear, R. A. The Evaluation Interview. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973.

General Electric Company. Employment Office Model. Connecticut: General Electric, 1978.

Haefele, Donald L. "The Teacher Perceiver Interview: How Valid?" Phi Delta Kappan, June, 1978.

Hodgkinson, Harold L. Campus Governance: The Amazing Thing Is That It Works At All, Report No. 11. Washington, D. C.: ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education, July, 1971.

Keeton, Morris and others. Shared Authority on Campus. Washington: American Association for Higher Education, 1971.

Landrith, Harold F. Introduction to the Community Junior College. Illinois: The Interstate Printers and Publishers, 1971.

London, Manuel. "What Every Personnel Director Should Know About Management Promotion Decisions," Personnel Journal. October, 1978.

Luxenberg, Stan. "Education at A.T. & T.," Change. December/January, 1978/79.

Magarrel, Jack. "The Enrollment Roller Coaster: Colleges Fear the Big Dip," Chronicle of Higher Education. September 5, 1978.

Marsh, John F., and Stafford, Frank P. "The Effects of Values on Pecuniary Behavior," American Sociological Review. 1967.

McSherry, Edward. Telephone interview. Armonk, New York, December 13, 1978.

Medsker, Leland L., and Tillery, Dale. Breaking the Access Barriers. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971.

Monroe, Charles R. Profile of the Community College. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1972.

Poort, Stephen M. Guidelines for the Recruitment and Selection of Community College Faculty. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 058 868, 1971.

Pratt, George L. B. Flexibility of Personality As It Relates to the Hiring and Retention of Public Community College Faculty in New York State. New York: New York University, 1966.

Priest, Bill J. "Governance Structures for the 70's: A Participational, Transitional, Traditional Viewpoint." For the A.A.J.C. Panel on February, 1978. (Mimeographed.)

Richardson, Richard C. "The Participational Model of Governance," Paper presented at the A.A.J.C. Annual Meeting, October 23, 1978.

Scully, Malcolm G. "Academic Musical Chairs: Many Say the Game's Ending," Chronicle of Higher Education, October 23, 1978.

Short, Lawrence O., and Taber, Lynville E. "The Selection Interview: An Interim Approach," Public Personnel Management. March/April, 1978.

State University of New York. Policies of the Board of Trustees. New York: 1977.

Tidgewell, John and Kralik, Dan. Teacher Selection: A Unique Approach to Select Career Instructors. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document EJ 105 421, 1975.

Wharton, Clifton R. "Chancellor's Agenda: Who Will Teach?" The News. October, 1978.

APPENDIX A: STUDENT SURVEY

Directions: Please answer the following by marking an "X" in the appropriate space.

Questions:

(1) Sex

a) Male _____

b) Female _____

(2) I am enrolled in the

a) Agricultural and Life Sciences Division _____

b) Engineering Technologies Division _____

c) General Studies Division _____

d) Management Division _____

e) Non-Traditional Studies Division _____

f) Vocational Division _____

(3) I am a

a) Freshman _____

b) Senior _____

(4) What role do you, as a student, believe undergraduates should play in decisions on the initial hiring of faculty?

a) Control _____

b) Voting power on committees _____

c) Formal consultation _____

d) Informal consultation _____

e) Little or no role _____

APPENDIX B: FACULTY SURVEY

I. Cover Letter

Dear Professor _____:

Your help is urgently needed.

A survey of this type was used in a national study, sponsored by the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. I will be comparing the national results with those I survey at Delhi. This project is aimed at assessing faculty characteristics, as well as asking several questions on faculty selection procedures.

Please do not place your name on the questionnaire, but please keep this sheet attached, so I can determine who has completed the form. Once your name has been crossed off the check sheet, the cover letter will be thrown away, and your anonymity will be guaranteed.

Won't you please take five minutes now and provide the information needed and return the form in today's mail?

Sincerely,

II. Questionnaire:

Directions: (1) Please fill in your Division _____

Option _____

Sex _____

(2) Please answer the following by marking an "X" in the appropriate space.

Questions: (1) My age is

a) under 30 ____

b) between 30 and 50 ____

c) over 50 ____

(2) I have been employed at Delhi for

a) under 3 years ____

b) between 3 and 6 years ____

c) over 6 years ____

(3) I have continuing appointment

a) yes ____

b) no ____

(4) I would prefer working at a four-year college or industry

a) yes ____

b) no ____

c) uncertain ____

(5) I would consider sending my children to a two-year college

a) yes ___

b) no ___

c) uncertain ___

d) not applicable ___

(6) I attended a two-year college as an undergraduate

a) yes ___; if yes, were you ever employed at a two-year college before coming to Delhi: yes ___

no ___

b) no ___; if no, were you ever employed at a two-year college before coming to Delhi: yes ___

no ___

(7) I have completed a course or courses dealing specifically with two-year colleges

a) yes, prior to coming to Delhi ___

b) yes, since coming to Delhi ___

c) yes, both prior and since coming to Delhi ___

d) no ___

(8) What role do you believe undergraduates should play in decisions on the initial hiring of faculty?

a) control ___

b) voting power on committees ___

c) formal consultation ___

d) informal consultation ___

e) little or no role ___

(9) What role do you believe <u>faculty</u> should play in decisions on the initial hiring of faculty?

a) control ____

b) voting power on committees ____

c) formal consultation ____

d) informal consultation ____

e) little or no role ____

(10) Before faculty are hired, do you believe that they should be asked to give a lecture or seminar to determine how effective a classroom teacher they will be?

a) yes ____

b) no ____

c) uncertain ____

APPENDIX C: LETTER SENT TO SELECTED PERSONNEL DIRECTORS*

Dear Sir:

My current research interests are in educational administration. I hope to write a paper outlining a strategy to implement a policy for the selection of new faculty.

Unlike industry, education has not in general organized such a policy statement. While federal and state laws mandate fair hiring practices by establishing certain guidelines, academia has not attempted to extend those guidelines to incorporate procedures to optimize its selection policies; such a policy, if it were to be developed, would oftentimes lead to the first campus-wide plan to employ and promote the best available personnel and, hence, strengthen the image of a college as a leading academic institution.

Part of my research has led to looking at industrial models of selection, and I hope that you could share with me the steps taken in hiring the best qualified applicatn at your company; e.g., interviewing techniques, assessment of credentials, application forms, if there is any probationary period, etc. In general, how does your company attract, evaluate, and retain the best workers the company can support?

Realizing your other commitments, I would appreciate any assistance.

Sincerely,

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

MAY 18 1979

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGES

*Letters sent to the Chase Manhattan Bank, I.B.M., General Electric, Eastman Kodak Company, Leviton Manufacturing Company, and the Polaroid Corporation.